

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 49, No. 11

MARCH 5, 1956

WHOLE No. 1206

THE CLASSICAL AUTHORS SINCE 1900

Platnauer's Fifty Years of Classical Scholarship

A Review-Article by STERLING DOW and Others

DEDICATED TO THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND ON ITS FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY

PART II

CONTENTS

Chapter	Author	Reviewer	Page
V The Greek Philosophers (cont.)	Sir David Ross	W. M. CALDER, III	145
VI The Greek Historians	G. T. Griffith	M. H. CHAMBERS	146
VII Greek Orators and Rhetoric	H. L. Hudson-Williams	G. A. KENNEDY	148
VIII Hellenistic Poetry	E. A. Barber	B. OTIS	149
IX Roman Drama	W. A. Laidlaw	P. W. HARSH	152
X Late Republican Poetry		J. P. ELDER	152
Lucretius	C. Bailey		
Catullus	R. G. C. Levens		
XI The Augustan Poets	T. E. Wright	B. OTIS	154
XII Roman Oratory	S. F. Bonner	G. A. KENNEDY	156
XIII The Roman Historians	A. H. McDonald	T. R. S. BROUGHTON	157
XIV Silver Latin Poetry	H. H. Huxley	R. T. BRÜERE	159
Misprints			160

Chapter V. *The Greek Philosophers*. By SIR DAVID ROSS. (Pages 130-149)

(Continued from No. 9, Feb. 6, 1956)

As Mr. Diamandopoulos indicates, Sir David Ross' account of *the Greek Philosophers* is almost entirely a bibliography of fifty years' work in the field. Five general criticisms of the bibliography are submitted:

1. Title and author are consistently set in the text, while place and date of publication are relegated to a note. Since, as in all other chapters, notes are printed at the end of the article, the practice here is particularly inconvenient.

2. There is no critical appraisal of the individual items either by the author himself or through reference to a review. The tiro especially misses such material.

3. Lists (e.g. pp. 134.1-3, 135.4-6) of authors alone with no titles at all are introduced into the narrative with a remark such as "General

books on Plato have been written by." A number after each name leads to a note revealing a city and date. The reader must assemble a comprehensive bibliography of each figure mentioned by Ross (no small task in the case of such producers as Wilamowitz), arrange it chronologically, and find what book falls into Ross' year. The task is rendered more difficult when an author produces more than one work on the same subject in one year. I assume F. Brentano (p. 140.3-4) means *Aristoteles u. s. Weltanschauung* and not the item at p. 140.18-19.

4. The promiscuous grouping of works of varying character with no set classifications renders the use of the essay as a reference bibliography impractical. W. C. Greene's edition of the Platonic scholia, for example, is listed (p. 135.16) in the midst of twenty-four secondary works, largely philosophical.

5. Pages are never supplied for periodical

references. Thus a single entry (e.g. *Hermes* in n. 17) may conceal, misleadingly, two distinct references (Deichgräber, pp. 10-19; Dirlmeier, pp. 329-331).¹

WILLIAM M. CALDER, III
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

1. Addenda and corrigenda (briefly): add *passim* O. Gigon, *Antike Philosophie* (Bern 1948; = *Bibliographische Einführungen in das Studium d. Philosophie* 5), a useful (and usable) introductory bibliography to the field; and more recently, D. J. Allan, "A Survey of Work Dealing with Greek Philosophy from Thales to the Age of Cicero 1945-49", *PhilosQ* 1 (1950) 61-72; p. 130.24 (last line of par. 2): after *Cognition* add from *Alcmaeon* to *Aristotle*.

Pre-Socratics: p. 130.28ff: add E. L. Minar, Jr., "A Survey of Recent Work in Pre-Socratic Philosophy," *CW* 47 (1953-54) 161-170, 177-182, and J. B. McDiarmid's important (see Kirk, *CQ* NS 5 [1955] 21ff.) "Theophrastus on the Presocratic Causes," *HSCP* 61 (1953) 85-156; 130.33: after "1892" add "ed. 4, 1930 (repr. 1945)"; 131.9: for the Pre-Socratics read *Presocratic Philosophy*; 131.16: for *Ancient Greece* read *Pre-Socratic Philosophy* (excluding *Anaxagoras*) and add W. Nestle, *Vom Mythos zum Logos* (Stuttgart 1940).

Under "particular Pre-Socratics": p. 131.19ff.: for *Anaximander* add Jacoby on *FGH* 244F29; 131.31: read "Macchiore"; 35: read *Heracleitus*; 36: read "Maz-zantini" and add G. S. Kirk, *Heracitus, The Cosmic Fragments* (Cambridge 1954); 132.9f.: add J. A. Davison, *CQ* NS 3 (1953) 39ff.; 132.18ff.: for *Sophists* add *Sofisti, Testimonianze, e Frammenti*, ed. M. Untersteiner (3 vols; Firenze 1949-54).

In the discussion of literature on Plato: p. 134.21: add *Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt's* reprint of Bonitz, *Index Aristotelicus* (Graz 1955); 134.37: the E. B. England item (see detailed review of R. G. Bury, *CR* 36 [1922] 173-75) is text and commentary; 135.8: the Barker item was revised and reprinted as *Greek Political Theory: Plato and His Predecessors* (ed. 3; London 1947); 135.16: on W. C. Greene, *Scholae Platonicae*, see Oldfather, *CP* 36 (1941) 371-389, and H. Erbse, *Untersuchungen zu den attizistischen Lexica* (Berlin 1950) 48 n. 2; 135.25: read *Frühschriften*; 136.5: after "Stocks" add "*CQ* 5 (1911) 73-88."

Aristotle: p. 136.36ff.: a convenient introductory bibliography to Aristotle is M. D. Philippe, *Aristoteles* (Bern 1948; = *Bibliographische Einführungen*, etc. 8); for Aristotle Ross lists Loeb editions among texts and commentaries, but not for Plato; 139.19-20: the Loeb Aristotle is not yet complete; 139.35: W. Jaeger's *O.C.T. Metaphysica* is in preparation; 139.33: for "Droossaart" read "Drossaart"; 139.39: for *AthPol* add cross-reference to G. T. Griffith (*Fifty Years* 162ff.).

Aristotle ("particular subjects"): p. 140.10: read *Möglichkeitsschlüsse*; 140.11: for Aristotle's read *Aristotelian*; 140.36ff.: for *Poetics* add L. Cooper and A. Gudeman, *A Bibliography of the Poetics of Aristotle* (New Haven 1928), and G. F. Else, "A Survey of Work on Aristotle's Poetics, 1940-1954," *CW* 48 (1954-55) 73-82; 140.38: after *Poétique* add *d'Aristote*; 141.2: read P. Wilpert; 141.22-23: read "Bergsträsser" and *Sitzungs-*

Chapter VI. *The Greek Historians*. By G. T. GRIFFITH. (Pages 150-192)

G. T. Griffith's chapter excels in several ways, most enjoyably in its leisurely manner. He has avoided the easy decision to write a purely bibliographical "progress report," for reference only, and his contribution can be read continuously with satisfaction. It will be referred to not less for the opinions of a man of good sense. This is as it should be: even a surveyor should commit himself with positive judgments. And, so far from neglecting the relevant bibliography,

berichte der Heidelberger Akad. der Wiss.; 141.27: add G. M. A. Grube, "Theophrastus as a Literary Critic," *TAPA* 83 (1952) 172-183.

On the later philosophers: p. 142.1ff.: for Epicurus add P. De Lacy, "Some Recent Publications on Epicurus and Epicureanism (1937-1954)," *CW* 48 (1954-55) 167-177, 232; 142.13: for *les read ses*; 142.27f.: the van Straaten item was revised as *Panaetii Rhodii Fragmenta* (Leiden 1952); 142.32 for "L." read "I."; 142.33f.: read *Poseidonios* for *Poseidonius* in German titles; 143.2: after Vooy's add "and D. A. van Krevelen"; 143.9ff.: to Philo items add H. A. Wolfson, *Philo* (2 vols; Cambridge, Mass., 1947); 143.12: after Whitaker add "and Ralph Marcus," and see A. D. Nock, *CR* NS 5 (1955) 107-108; 143.20: for Epictetus add W. A. Oldfather et al., *Contributions toward a Bibliography of Epictetus: A Supplement* (Urbana 1952); 143.39: read *Alexandre*; 144.12: for Plotinus' read *Plotinus*; 144.34f.: to Proclus add *In rem publicam*, ed. W. Kroll (2 vols; Leipzig 1899-1901) and *In Timaeum*, ed. E. Diehl (3 vols; Leipzig 1903-06).

In the notes (pp. 146-149), correct as follows: n.1: add "ed. 2, 1948"; 33: for 1939 read 1940; 40: for "Leyden" read "Groningen"; 89: add "repr. 1950"; 102: for 1934 read 1903; 103: add "repr. 1920"; 105: add "revised by Snell, 1948"; 113: this should read "Breslau, 1917; ed. 2, Leipzig 1931"; 121: for 1939 read 1938; 166: add "ed. 2, 1911"; 181: for 1939 read 1929; 189: for 1931 read 1913, and add "ed. 2, 1946"; 199: for 1929 read 1924; 200: for 1929 read 1928; 224: add "revised 1946"; 314: add "ed. 2, 1948."

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published weekly from October for sixteen (16) issues, except for any weeks in which there is an academic vacation. Volume 49 contains issues dated October 17, 24; November 14, 28; December 12 (1955); January 9, 23, 30; February 6, 27; March 5, 19; April 9, 16, 23, 30 (1956).

Owner and Publisher, The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of publication, Fordham University, 441 East Fordham Road, New York 58, N. Y.

General subscription price, \$3.75 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$4.25.

Reentered as second class matter December 14, 1950 at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925 authorized December 14, 1950.

G.'s fifteen pages of notes are much the fullest report in the volume. (It is no wonder that among the hundreds of citations some errors have crept in: cf. n. 2 *infra*.) Although G.'s subject is the historians themselves, he takes the opportunity to mention certain historical works (e.g. *ATL*) when appropriate. And his final remarks seem to carry the subject into the next fifty years, instead of closing it off with one last reference.

G. opens with an allusion to the discovery of the *Athenaion Politeia*, observing that we have not been so fortunate since. He hesitates (pp. 150, 163) definitely to ascribe this work to Aristotle himself: renewed scepticism on this important point has already been one of the effects of C. Hignett's *History of the Athenian Constitution*.¹ Hignett, of course, does not deny the fact that this is the work known to antiquity as Aristotle's.

On Herodotus and Thucydides, to whom he returns at the end, G. is good. He well represents the present century's desire to seek the "mind" of the historian; and of course this search must embrace the questions of sources and of composition, as well as the obviously important one, whether the writer told the truth. Excavation has given us the archon-list (*Hesperia* 8 [1939] 59ff.). The fragment suggests some information about the nature of the list: apparently it was only a bare list of names. This fact should influence judgments about, for example, the sources of Hellanicus.

As to Herodotus, his tendentious Alcmeonid source is now better documented; the stone refutes his claim (6.123.1) that the Alcmeonids were in exile throughout the tyranny of the Pisistratid house. And we can now better understand why he glorifies the Callias of 6.121: his Alcmeonid friends were being criticized for their part in the Peace of another Callias, 449. The question of the composition of Herodotus' work has not progressed so far as has the "Thucydidean question," and probably it cannot—passages like 6.53.1 prove little: but G. is probably right in doubting (against Pohlenz) that Herodotus discerned his "grand design" at the very beginning. Historically, Herodotus has continued to rise in estimation, scoring heavily with his *Skythika* and with the easy candor of his observations. (But is he "perhaps the most admired" of all Greek prose writers?)

1. C. Hignett, *A History of the Athenian Constitution to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford 1952) 27-30.

No one in this century has overthrown Ulrich's demonstration that Thucydides made two drafts of his work, and this view (so G., p. 157) will surely survive. Nor should this ceaselessly debated question be divorced from that of Thucydides' sources, e.g. Antiochus (most recently, and best, K. J. Dover, *Maia* NS 6 [1953] 1-20) and various witnesses to the events. H. D. Westlake has made good studies of this problem (e.g. *PCA* 50 [1953] 27, to be added to G.; and now *CQ* NS 5 [1955] 53-67), and we shall no doubt find much in K. Ziegler's forthcoming article in *RE*. Little need has been felt to uphold Thucydides as a trustworthy reporter. On the contrary, he perhaps needs more criticism than he has received: the aim of such criticism would be to show where he is to be believed, as well as where he is to be doubted. Mid-century has seen the completion of the great work on the tribute-lists, and it is likely that continued study of the documents will throw more light on Thucydides' work as historian.

Authorship of Hellenica Oxyrhynchia

The most sensational discovery of our period has been the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* (published in 1908, not 1907 as G., p. 160), and G. well summarizes the position reached. Theopompus, Androtion, Ephorus among the early candidates for the authorship have all been ruled out. Cratippus would poll the most votes today, but we may agree with G. that there is yet no compelling reason to reject Daimachos of Plataea, long supported by F. Jacoby. Just recently the new fragments of the same work (*PSI* 1304 [1949]) have shown that Ephorus, or Diodorus at least, occasionally "contaminated" his account by dipping into Xenophon (in 1935 G. L. Barber [*The Historian Ephorus* 137] could still deny that Ephorus used Xenophon, and, as said, it may be Diodorus who did). And, a stroke of luck, we have now the first four letters of Thucydides' name in these fragments of his continuator. Historically, one major effect of these *Hellenica* has been to lower the reputation of Xenophon's work for the years 396-5.

In treating the Attidographers, G. mentions the magnitude of that landmark, Jacoby's *Atthis*. Surely only Felix Jacoby, with his unapproached learning and restless critical sharpness, could have disentangled these essential threads of Greek history-writing. The tortuous arrangement of the book makes us no less lucky to have it. The controversy on the *exegetai* goes on. But (with G., p. 151) it may fairly be said that Ja-

coby, with his articles in *RE* and above all his *FGrHist*, is responsible for more progress in the study of Greek historiography than is any other man. Since 1902 he has been preparing a rich legacy for the next fifty years and more, and it is good to know (*FGrHist* III B, preface; now *AJP* 74 [1953] 295) that the completion of his work, by H. Bloch and F. Gisinger, is assured.

The estimates by G. (a specialist in the Hellenistic period) of Polybius and of Plutarch are especially sound. (Add to note 95 *CQ* NS 4 [1954] 97ff.) The habit of studying Plutarch as historian through the lives of only his greatest subjects, and these too much in isolation from each other, has not had happy results; and it is to be hoped that others will emulate the fine essay on Plutarch embedded in Gomme's commentary on Thucydides. For example, fruitful comparisons can be made between Plutarch's balanced and dramatic treatment of Coriolanus and the tiresome narrative of his main source, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (cf. *Plut. Cor.* 4 on the character of his subject). Finally, in speaking of Diodorus, G. could have elevated into his text the name of Ed. Schwartz, whose model article in *RE* (itself practically an achievement of these fifty years) is truly, as the greatest of historians said, "a possession for all time."

The following additions and corrections to the Notes (pp. 177-192) of Chapter VI may be mentioned to help the reader. (If there is one unhappy custom that the next fifty years will do well to suppress, it is the gratuitous manufacture of "new series" in the periodicals. As will be seen, G. has had good cause to regret, if that is the proper word, this practice.)

4: No volumes of *FGrHist* III C have appeared. The latest vols. are the Supplement, III b (vols. I-II) to III B. They contain the commentary (English) to the Attidographers. Volumes of *FGrHist* should always be noted with Roman numerals.

16: read *RFC* NS 4.

21: *TAPA* 67 was 1936.

22: Legrand's *Budé Hérodote* is complete (1955).

30: *CQ* and *CR* began new series in 1951. Add NS here and elsewhere (e.g., n. 34).

32: Luchnat's book part of *Philologus*, Supplbd. 34; Momigliano in *MAT* NS 67 (1933) 1ff.

33: read *RFC* NS 17.

34: Page's article begins on p. 97, not 1.

37: Kirchhoff has lost an h here (and in n. 11); his book was 1895, not 1885; *Hesperia* 8, not 81.

38: Classen-Steup's latest edition, 3rd to 5th; Hude's *maxima*, 1898-1901, should be added; his minor first appeared 1901; Livingstone's "translation" was based mostly on Crawley, and was incomplete; Hemmerdinger is in *REG* 61, not 58. (1948 correct); den Hout (not Hont) in *Mnemosyne*, ser. 4, 2 (not 45, 2).

39: Hude was 1915, not 1925.

40: Gomme's *Sather Lectures*, 1954.

42: on Cleon, Gomme in *Hellenika* 13 (1954) 1ff.

57: *RFC* NS 13 (1935).

67: Sordi begins on p. 34.

69: *REG* 59 (1946), not 69.

70: The editor, who is graciously thanked by G., might have normalized the abbreviations (e.g. *AcR*) throughout.

72: *RFC* NS 14.

73: Timaeus appears in *FGrHist* III B (not "3A").

75: *RFC* NS 10 (1932).

87: on page 169 there are two references to this footnote. The second (Polybius) is the one evidently intended. The first, which calls for matter on Hieronymus of Cardia, etc., seems to have dropped out.

89: Polybios (not Polyios); J. (not I.) V. A. Fine.

93: Grasso is p. 439.

107: *Mnemosyne* ser. 3, 4, not 65. Next page, Klotz in *ib.* ser. 3, 5 (1938).

108: *SFC* 8 (1930, not 1931).

115: Edition of Dionysius: C. Jacoby, I-IV (not IV), 1885-1905; *Mnemosyne* NS (but in the *nova series* NS may well be omitted) 38 (1910); *Eranos* 43 (not 7).

126: R. (not P.) S. Rogers.

128: K. Hartmann's article is in *Philologus* 74 (1917) 73ff., not *Mnemosyne* 1946; next page, *Mnemosyne* 54 (1926).

MORTIMER CHAMBERS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Chapter VII. *Greek Orators and Rhetoric*. By H. L. HUDSON-WILLIAMS. (Pages 192-213)

The chapter is divided into two parts, of which the first takes up the Attic orators one by one. It is thus possible easily to find references to a specific author or work, a situation often otherwise difficult in this indexless volume. The discussions of the individual orators are quite adequate, but the following points may be noted:

P. 195 and note 14: There is a *maior editio altera corrector* of Thalheim's *Lysias*, Leipzig 1913.

P. 197: Pierre Roussel's *Budé* edition of Isaeus, Paris 1922, should perhaps be mentioned, especially since it does include fragments.

P. 200 and note 49: The Widener copy of this work bears the publisher's date and place as "1937 Bonner Universitäts Buchdruckerei Gebr. Scheur." Perhaps two editions were issued.

Of the work done on Demosthenes in this century, that devoted to the papyrus commentary on the *Philippics* by Didymus should not pass

unmentioned.¹ Clemenceau's "fiery panegyric" (cf. 201 and note 65) was translated into English by Charles M. Thompson and published in Boston under the title *Demosthenes* in 1926.

The discussion of the scholarship on rhetoric is a valiant effort to report what is of lasting value in this chaotic but fascinating field. Unfortunately the organization of the volume precluded the synoptic view necessary to give a complete picture of what has been accomplished. The scholarship simply does not group itself under the headings of a few authors or even of a single subject. A thorough account would have involved not only oratory and rhetoric, but logic, grammar, and poetics. In the great abyss of Hellenistic criticism—the study of which Saintsbury described as congenial only to those fond of the pastime of letting down buckets into empty wells—the study of the last two has provided several stable footings. I would refer particularly to the works of Jensen on Philodemus and his predecessors,² Other works basic to the study of Hellenistic rhetoric are Theodor Herrle's *Quaestiones*,³ Barczat on figures,⁴ and (from the 90's) Thiele's *Hermagoras*⁵ and von Arnim's *Dio*.⁶ Cross references here (the responsibility of the general editor) to the early part of the chapter on Roman Oratory (e.g. to page 338 on Stoic rhetoric) would have involved little effort and accomplished much good.

To the discussion of rhetoric I would also make the following additions:

P. 203 and note 76: It would probably be better to refer to the second edition of Norden, 1909, in which slight changes were made. The third edition, of 1915, was, I believe, unaltered.

P. 204: To the general works on sophistry and rhetoric should now be added Kathleen

Freeman's translation of Untersteiner's *The Sophists*.⁷

P. 205 and note 93: *JKPh* 27 containing Dreyer's article should read *JKPh Supplementband* 27.

Pp. 206-207: A serious omission relative to Aristotle's *Rhetoric* is the work of Friedrich Solmsen (based on the theories of Jaeger, cf. *Fifty Years*, p. 137) on the development of the logical and rhetorical writings.⁸ The much discussed problem of the *Theoedectea* and of the relation of the third book of the *Rhetoric* to the rest of the work may well be solved along this line. A somewhat earlier but praiseworthy attempt was that of K. Barwick.⁹

P. 206: To the editions of the *Rhetoric* add Antonio Tovar's new Spanish edition with an interesting introduction, text, apparatus, translation, and some notes.¹⁰

P. 209: To say that the only point on which there seems to be agreement on the treatise *On the Sublime* is that the author was not Cassius Longinus is an overstatement, for there is at least general agreement on the influences which the treatise represents and on a first century A.D. date, which is accepted even by the standard handbooks.

A peculiarity of this chapter is the omission of page numbers in giving references. One feels that the general editor here and in other ways has failed to perform his duties. He has given us no real introduction, no statement of aims, no standardized style of references, no cross references, no index. Hudson-Williams has, however, done a good job and the chapter will be of great use to future researchers.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

GEORGE A. KENNEDY

Chapter VIII. *Hellenistic Poetry*. By E. A. BARBER. (Pages 214-232).

In general Barber's chapter is a good summary of the material. Naturally he gives most space to the papyrus finds which represent by far the most striking novelty in this field. His

1. Esp. H. Diels and W. Schubart, *Didymos Kommentar zu Demosthenes*, Berlin 1904, and M. Paul Foucart, *Etude sur Didymos d'après un papyrus de Berlin*, Paris 1907.

2. Christian Jensen, *Philodemus Ueber die Gedichte*, Fünftes Buch, Berlin 1923 and "Herakleides vom Pontos bei Philodem und Horaz" *SBBerlin* 1936 292ff.

3. Theodor Herrle, *Quaestiones Rhetoricae ad Elocutionem Pertinentes*, Leipzig 1912.

4. Willy Barczat, *De Figurarum Disciplina atque Auctoribus*, Göttingen 1904.

5. Georg Thiele, *Hermagoras—Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Rhetorik*, Strassburg 1893.

6. Hans von Arnim, *Leben und Werke des Dio von Prusa*, Berlin 1898.

7. Mario Untersteiner, *The Sophists*, translated from the Italian by Kathleen Freeman, Oxford 1954.

8. Friedrich Solmsen, *Die Entwicklung der aristotelischen Logik und Rhetorik*, Berlin 1929.

9. K. Barwick, "Die Gliederung der rhetorischen techné und die Horazische *Epistula ad Pisones*," *Hermes* 57 (1922) 1ff.

10. Antonio Tovar, *Aristoteles Rhetorica*, Madrid 1953.

account of what in fact we have learned from the papyri—what real effect they have had on our picture of the age and its great figures, Callimachus, Theocritus and Apollonius of Rhodes—is much less satisfactory.

Aside from the mimes of Herodas (whose discovery—Kenyon's *editio princeps* is dated 1891—lies strictly outside the 50-year period), the real beneficiary of the papyrus finds is undoubtedly Callimachus. Beside the fragments of the *Aetia*, *Iambi*, and *Hecale* we now possess a partial table of contents (in the so-called *Diegesis*) of what may well be Callimachus' own edition of his poems (though in no sense a complete edition). The additions to our knowledge of Theocritus are not nearly so striking (though the new light on Idyll XXIV and a new aeolic poem after XXX are significant discoveries). The other new papyri do not add very much: a few new epigrams (Leonidas, Antipater Philicus), some disappointing bits of Euphronion, and a certain amount of lighter verse, especially the Meliambi of Cercidas and the so-called Grenfell fragment, an hetaira's plea to her lover.

Thus despite the impressive number of discoveries in this field, it is fair to say that they are of primary importance only for Callimachus. In effect Barber admits this (though his detailed history of the finds inevitably mixes the significant and the insignificant).

Callimachus, Theocritus, Apollonius

The other great advance is, as he points out, in new editions, of which by far the most important is Rudolf Pfeiffer's epoch-making *Callimachus* (1949, 1953), though Gow's *Theocritus* (1952) is also in the grand style. There is no new Apollonius (now the greatest *desideratum* in this field) since Mooney's inadequate text and commentary of 1912. J. U. Powell's *Collectanea Alexandrina* and Diehl's *Anthologia Lyrica* are still indispensable even if in part outmoded. There is nothing recent or outstanding on Aratus or Lycophron, but Gow and Scholfield's recent (1953) edition of Nicander is an extremely useful work (the translation especially so).

But what have the new discoveries and editions accomplished? What new light do they shed and what new advances do they foreshadow? Here it seems to me Barber's review of the period is not so satisfactory. In two pages (226-227) he refers to the well known works of Couat, W. Schmid, Körte, Legrand, Susemihl as well as the various and rather uninspired chapters in

the *CAH*, and English histories of Greek Literature (such as F. A. Wright and H. J. Rose). He mentions Cahen on Callimachus, Bignone on Theocritus and such older work as Rohde's *Der griechische Roman* (1876) and Reitzenstein's *Epigramm und Skolion* (1893). Of the epoch-making *Hellenistische Dichtung* (1924) of Wilamowitz all he says is that though "it reveals the master's hand on every page and contains countless fresh suggestions and novel illustrations," it "can be properly appreciated only by readers already well acquainted with this poetry and its problems." This may be, but Barber fails to tell us how in fact the work of Wilamowitz or others has altered our picture of the Hellenistic age or what the new papyri have done to alter it. What, for example, do the abundant new material and excellent commentary in Pfeiffer's Callimachus do to Callimachus?

Barber discusses briefly two familiar issues (pp. 228-230): the quarrel between Callimachus and Apollonius, and the chronology of the chief poems of Callimachus, Theocritus, and Apollonius. He does not think that "present evidence" allows us to know much: "the truth is," he says, "that despite all the new discoveries and indeed because of them we realize better today the limits of our knowledge."

This seems to me rather excessively negative. Thus it seems significant that it is now clear (a) that the poems of the *Aetia* are separate without any transition or connection (cf. Pfeiffer II, *Prolegomena* xxxv, and Barber, less accurately, on p. 216); (b) that the prologue to the *Aetia* in *POxy* 2079 may well be a late preface to the poet's own edition of his works (Pfeiffer, *op. cit.* xxxvi); (c) that the Telchines of the prologue refer to peripatetic critics of Callimachus who lauded Antimachus' Lyde and blamed Callimachus for not writing an *aeisma dienekes*; (d) that Apollonius took whole verses from the *Aetia* (e.g. *Arg.* I 1309 = *Aet.* I fr. 12,6 Pfeiffer); (e) that Theocritus probably "corrected" the relevant portions of the *Argonautica* in Idylls XII and XIII (cf. Gow, *Theocritus*, II 231, 384).

Chronology

All this would certainly point to: (1) the *Aetia* (except the later preface) preceded the *Argonautica*; (2) Theocritus XIII and XXII followed *Argonautica* I and II; (3) both Theocritus and Callimachus upheld the short poem against the Antimachan and Apollonian *aeisma dienekes*; and (4) there seems no reason why we cannot

accept the testimony of *PSI* 1219 that the *Telchines* upheld the epic on Aristotelian principles (here the article of K. O. Brink, *CQ* 40 [1946] 11ff., is important, though in need, I think, of revision), whereas Callimachus defended the principles of brevity and variety (*polyeideia*; cf. Pfeiffer I 205 = *Diegeseis* IX 34) as is indeed illustrated in his deliberately contrived variety of elegiac, iambic, lyric, and heroic verse.

The great difficulty here is that, according to Gow, Theocritus wrote *Idyll* XIII as a young man presumably not so long after XVI which, it seems, must be dated about 275/4 B.C. (Gow, I xxi). If this is true, and the *Argonautica* preceded these *Idylls*, and the *Aetia* preceded the *Argonautica*, we should have to date the *Aetia* very close to 300—which seems almost impossible. This is why Pfeiffer rejects the arguments of Gow for the priority of the *Argonautica* to *Idyll* XIII. Yet Gow's argument here seems absolutely sound (and Knaack and Wilamowitz thought likewise). What we must do therefore (if this is so) is to put *Idylls* XIII and XXII fairly late as Gow (II 591) finally agrees. This would suggest a date of about 265 or so for the height of the quarrel. In short, though the new evidence of the papyri does not clear up the complexity of the dates completely, it does suggest a solution and indicates, it seems to me, the literary nature of the "quarrel" very clearly. (W. Allen, Jr., *TAPA* 71 [1940] 6 denied that the evidence permitted any such conclusions; this seems to me a simple discarding of *PSI* 1219 and *Diegeseis* IX 34, not to mention the earlier evidence.) In any event the "quarrel" is not so crucial as the literary practice and theory of Theocritus and Callimachus which the *Diegeseis*, the *Florentine Scholia*, and *POxy* 2079 have now illuminated. It is clear that there is still a good deal of work to be done here; cf. the interesting article of Fritz Wehrli in *Phyllobolia* (*Festschrift* . . . P. von der Mühl), Basel 1952.

Barber, it seems to me, is wholly correct in his negative appraisal of Ziegler's *Hellenistische Epos* (1934), which tried to prove that Callimachus' theory of brevity and *polyeideia* was merely a 'short episode' in a continuous epic tradition (here Gow [I xxii] has taken Ziegler far too seriously). The fact seems to be, however, that the great Alexandrine poetry had little vogue between 240 B.C. and its later revival in the first century at Rome and elsewhere (all the papyri of the great Alexandrines are late, the earliest Callimachus papyrus, *PSI* 1092 being

only first century B.C.). The great Roman poetry is either Alexandrine or a revival of classical genres (Homer, Euripides, Alcaeus etc.). But the Hellenistic epic after Apollonius was a second-rate affair that was never taken seriously as literature.

Literary Value

So far as the intrinsic literary value of the new Callimachus is concerned, I find it very easy to restrain enthusiasm. Barber thinks that the new fragments on the love story of Phrygius and Pieria give us a heroine "considerably more attractive than the colourless Cydippe" (p. 228). (Actually we owe the only seven really complete lines of this episode to a brilliant fitting together of the fragments by Maas and Barber himself; cf. Pfeiffer II 113). But this is really too broken to grasp. The new *Iambi* have perhaps the most literary merit. (The *Hecale* fragments seem to me distinctly disappointing.) There is nothing here that we can compare with the *Hymns*, and I suggest as a useful exercise in scholarly humility a consideration of what we should know of the *Hymns* if we had to depend on the papyri.

Barber alludes briefly (pp. 227-228) to the question of the influence of this poetry on the Roman, rightly referring to W. Kroll's excellent *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (1924), to which should certainly be added his remarkable essay on the Hellenistic and Roman Epic (*Socrates* 70 [1916] 1-14), and his invaluable article on rhetoric in Pauly-Wissowa. A. A. Day on the *Origins of Latin Love-Elegy* (1938) and Miss Crump on the *Epyllion* (1931) are of a distinctly lesser order (the essay of Day throws little new light on an old controversy and Miss Crump's *Epyllion*, as Barber says, shows no awareness that the 'epyllion' is a modern invention). But Wilamowitz really said the decisive word on the subject of Hellenistic influence on Roman elegy in his *Hellenistische Dichtung*, I 228f., II 275f. Though we have had no papyrus finds of Hermesianax, Philetas, Phanocles et al., the general differences between Hellenistic literature and its Roman "imitators" ought now to be clear for all to see. In fact we can trace the passage from the Euphorionic style of the *Ciris* to the little epics of Virgil and Ovid and see the transformation even in the Latin itself. There is no way of coercing any belated adherent of Leo from a belief that e.g. Philetas or Phanocles had the full equivalent of a *Lesbia* or *Delia*

but at least we can now grasp the sense in which Propertius was and was not an imitator of Callimachus. Here the new knowledge gained from papyri is real even though it still requires decently sensitive interpretation.

I cannot close without calling attention to two invaluable articles of H. Herter not mentioned by Barber: his *Callimachus* in *RE*. Supplementband V, and his review of the literature on Hellenistic poetry (between 1921 and 1935) in *Bursians Jahresbericht* 255 (1937) 65-217.

HOBERT COLLEGE

BROOKS OTIS

Chapter IX. *Roman Drama*. By W. A. LAIDLAW. (Pages 233-271)

Laidlaw attempts "only to indicate the various trends of research and 'climates of opinion', to mention the most significant books and articles, and to refer to the bibliographies where the multifarious material may be traced" (233). These ends he achieves with admirable fairness and sanity of judgment; but we wish that he had been less modest in giving us his own critical opinions. Is Ernout's the best text of Plautus (if so, the publishers should issue it *texte seul* and at least one edition on better paper and in fewer volumes), and is the edition of Klotz now to be the standard one of Ennius? A qualitative judgment might well have been passed (237) on Jenkins, *Index Verborum Terentianus* [not *Terentii*], for this should be used only with great caution.¹ It is unfortunate that Sesto Prete's edition of Terence (Heidelberg 1953) appeared too late to be included by Laidlaw.

In reference to Seneca's tragedies, Laidlaw says (236): "In the Teubner series the tragedies were re-edited by R. Peiper and G. Richter in 1921." This is misleading: the issue of 1921 is marked "exemplar anastatice iteratum"; this work really dates from 1902 and even then Peiper was dead.

In considering problems of dramatic technique and especially contamination in comedy, Laidlaw explicitly and implicitly exercises more critical judgment—and it is good judgment. He would have done well, however, to question the view that parody "is the frivolous Roman reaction to Greek mythology . . ." (254).

The negative phase of such a study is impor-

tant, especially in an age when the bulk of scholarship piles up at such an alarming rate and when incisive elimination of the unimportant and the mistaken becomes more and more imperative. Still, the negative should be dealt with in brief and trenchant footnotes, and the text reserved primarily for the positive. Thus in considering the literature on Seneca's tragedies, Laidlaw devotes (262-263) considerable space to the theories of Marti only to end with his own skepticism and with Pratt's telling criticisms. Laidlaw might better have spent his limited space by summarizing the substantial positive contributions which Pratt himself has made to the sound interpretation of these so frequently misinterpreted tragedies.

The scholar who is active in this field, however, will, or at least should, often find himself returning to this valuable summary.

This reviewer cannot leave the accomplishments of the past fifty years without pouring forth some Simonidean tears over a tragicomedy which has not touched the heart of either Dover or Laidlaw: the pitiful dearth of modern commentaries which may be used in an ordinary class. It makes one weep to turn to *Aristophanes* in Nairn's *Classical Hand-List*: almost everything is marked *o.p.* Yes, we have, or rather had, Starkie, and the fact that two of his editions included translations would hardly detract from class use, for his "Irish" versions are far more difficult than the Greek; but where are the good school editions that should have been based upon Starkie and other modern scholarship? We have no up-to-date commentary even on Menander. The reviewer knows of one that was written, but no publisher could be found for it. Terence is in much the same sad state, although there are one or two usable class texts of Plautus. Our associations put forth all sorts of more or less learned monographs, but we have no modern texts with which to teach!

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

PHILIP W. HARSH

Chapter X. *Late Republican Poetry*: (i) *Lucretius*. By B. BAILEY. (ii) *Catullus*. By R. G. C. LEVENS. (Pages 272-305)

i. *Lucretius*

This is a sensibly balanced, thorough, and well documented survey, as we should expect from the dean of Lucretian scholars. In general, it notes as the major trends of the past fifty years' criticism: increased reliance on the Mss.;

1. For instance, under *mina*, the term for a sum of money, is included *minas*, 'threats' (*An.* 210).

more intensive study of Lucretian grammar, metre, vocabulary, syntax, and style; much greater use of Epicurean remains; and, most recently, attempts to find out how Lucretius' mind and imagination worked (undertaken, be it thankfully added, not to construct aimless hypotheses about the poet's psyche but to help us to understand the thing we care about, the poem itself). All of these trends — at least so it probably seems to most of us today — are salubrious substitutes for an earlier passion for emendation and transposition.

The following specific points occur to me. Most are minor. Note might have been taken of the fairly extreme — and challenging — orthography used in the edition of Leonard and Smith (see the interesting section on this in Smith's introduction). There is no good, I am sure, in grumbling at a whole page's being devoted (277) to *The Poet and the Poem*; the biographical approach has too long laid its heavy hand on classical scholarship. But why then omit here the only contemporary judgment on the poem — Cicero's — and the nearly contemporary ones of Nepos, Vitruvius, and Ovid? Why, too, is the problem of Lucretius' social standing "more important" than that of his provenance, life, and death? And why are not three important questions raised in this section (even though answers are not easy to give): how "incomplete" is the poem, what audience did Lucretius hope to reach by it, and what, if any, was Cicero's reaction to it? (For some references on these queries, see *TAPA* 85 [1954] 88-90, note 3, and 102, note 38.) On *Cicero emendavit* (p. 277), see J. Martin, "Lukrez und Cicero," *WJA* 4 (1949-50) 1-52 and 309-29. And why not, in referring to Sandbach, mention his useful query about the meaning of *poemata*?

On the "features of Lucretius' character and mind," add (pp. 277f. or on p. 282), the provocative — some would call it fantastic — study of J. Logre, *L'anxiété de Lucrèce* (Paris 1946). As for Lucretius' "faithfulness to the doctrine of Epicurus in all its details" (pp. 278 and 282-283), account should be taken of P. De Lacy's "Lucretius and the History of Epicureanism," *TAPA* 79 (1948) 12-23. So, too, when Bailey speaks of the temperamental differences between Lucretius and Epicurus, account (not necessarily agreement) should be taken of Bignone's views on this score.

On p. 278, the title *The Poem* should be *The Poem—Sources and Composition*; Merrill on its

diction belongs under *Style* on pp. 281f. In this section on *The Poem* the matter of its "incompleteness" might also appear, and surely, since we know that Epicurus ridiculed the poets and shunned popularization, the question should come up: why did Lucretius use poetry and deliberately thus try to catch our attention? (For various views on this problem, see the references given in *TAPA* 85 [1954] 106, note 47.) As for the order of the composition of the books, I, for one, should have welcomed some sort of questioning of the value of work on this subject.

Bailey's thesis (p. 279) that, for the construction of a text, we must know, beyond understanding the relationship of the Mss., an author's accident, his syntax, his metre, his prosody, and his sources — Bailey might also have added his habits of mind — deserves every classicist's attention and respect. Many of us, I dare say, prefer Bailey's methods to Housman's (p. 280). On p. 283 we can now add P. De Lacy's valuable "Some Recent Publications on Epicurus and Epicureanism," *CW* 48 (1954-55) 169-177. On the same page, Farrington's "later articles" deserve location (I know of three: *Hermathena* 1952 and 1954, and *Science and Society* 1953), and I wish that Bailey had evaluated here M. Rozelaar's *Lukrez*. Finally, I miss a reference in this survey to the single most helpful book on Lucretius, Paulson's index.

ii. *Catullus*

This survey, by R. G. C. Levens, is so excellent that, once that comment has been made, little else remains to be said. Its references are richly full (the notes are particularly valuable), its thoughtful criticisms and evaluations of these studies are just and candid, its discussion of such murky matters as the varying scholarly opinions (or lack of them) on the relationship of the many Mss. to one another (on which we hope for clarification from Professor Ullman) is as clear as such a subject can allow and detailed enough to be genuinely helpful. Its frequent pleas that this or that sort or piece of work should be done are constructive. I admire most of all the clean and distant objectivity with which Levens looks at the chief trends in the criticism of Catullus and assesses their worth. Thus, for example, he charges that in the case of this poet the scholar has lagged behind the general reader and that consequently we ought to have only "a very limited sense of achievement and progress" as we look back over the past fifty years (p. 284). So, too, he shrewdly (and probably right-

ly) observes that "work published in the 'thirties and 'forties on the language, metre, and style of Catullus is best regarded as transitional, to be superseded when the critical revolution enters upon a more stable phase" (p. 300). Such comments show an historical attitude that is rare in a critic!

Levens takes up the complete editions with commentaries (pathetically few and out of date) and the standard textual editions, the major translations (good, bad, and in between), the nonsense spun out (at the cost of honest or useful work) on constructing Catullus' biography, the course of his literary history and of the criticism on him, the muddled state of our knowledge about what either the Mss. actually give (esp. distinguishing between original hands and correctors) or how they tie up with each other, and finally the poet's language, metre, and style (on which add J. Svennung, *Catullus Bilder-sprache*, Uppsala 1945).

As was said above, these accounts do more than merely mention the chief studies on Catullus. They set forth fairly and lucidly the conclusions proposed by various scholars; they evaluate these conclusions; the accounts themselves are written with verve and forcefulness; and lastly, they remind us again and again of the great amount of basic work which remains to be done on this poet.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

J. P. ELDER

Chapter XI. *The Augustan Poets*. By T. E. WRIGHT. (Pages 306-334)

In general this chapter is poor and does little justice to the half century's work on Virgil, Horace, Ovid and the two elegists. Wright lists three specific advances of our knowledge in this period: the 'interpretation of Virgil's Eclogues,' 'our grasp of the relation of Horace's *Satires* and *Ars Poetica* to their Greek sources,' and 'our recognition of the originality of Roman personal love-elegy.' These it seems to me are dubious and, at best, 'peripheral gains, whereas the new literary interpretation of the *Aeneid*, *Metamorphoses*, and Augustan elegy inaugurated by Heinze and Walther Abel (whom Wright never mentions) are, in comparison, fundamental. In general Wright pays an altogether disproportionate attention to the relatively undistinguished British and American scholarship in this field and neglects the major developments.

1. *Virgil*. Wright refers at some length to the Anglo-Saxon literature on Virgil: Glover, Mac-kail, Haarhoff, W. F. J. Knight, E. K. Rand, Tenney Frank, R. S. Conway and Cyril Bailey. With the exception of Knight's interesting metrical analysis (which though exaggerated is a real contribution), it may be questioned whether all this literature—readable as it so often is—has really added anything to our knowledge. On the other hand it seems to be certain that the Rand-Conway controversy on Virgil's birthplace (to which Wright devotes some space) contributed nothing.

As to the *Eclogues*, Wright makes much of the ingenious publication of Skutsch, *Aus Vergils Frühzeit* (1901) as inaugurating a 'new era.' Skutsch held, it will be recalled, the theory that *Eclogues* VI and X contain a synopsis of Gallus' poems, in which the *Ciris* was included. This led to lengthy polemics and no certain result. The same can be said for the disputes as to the identity of the Child in *Eclogue* IV (despite the brilliance of Norden's *Geburt des Kindes*, 1924). Perhaps more is to be said for an 'allegorical' interpretation of the *Eclogues*: the only difficulty again is that certainty here is practically impossible; it is the realm of ingenious and unprovable hypothesis. Where it would seem to me there is more room for really significant research is in the careful comparison of the *Eclogues* with their source in Theocritus.

This is not to doubt that the *Eclogues* are full of references to Gallus, Pollio and others but to doubt how far we can ever hope to determine these and how much light such determination (if reached) would really shed on the poems. On the other hand there is certainly room for a treatment of Virgil which takes into account the abundant material in Gow's splendid *Theocritus* as well as the new light shed by the papyri on Theocritus' style and literary theory. But the great advance in the study of both *Eclogues* and *Georgics* is undoubtedly due to Friedrich Klingner (esp. *Römische Geisteswelt*, 1943; cf. also his brilliant little *Dichter und Dichtkunst im alten Rom*, 1947). It is only when we see the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* each as a 'work of art' which embodies a Roman original (in the *Georgics* Lucretius, just as Ennius in the *Aeneid*, Lucilius in Horace's *Satires*) and involves an entirely new technique and style, that we can grasp their 'originality'.

On the *Georgics* Wright lists a number of helpful English works of no particular profundity (certainly not that of Miss Crump who ac-

cording to Wright 'finely analyzes' the *fabula Aristaei*). Here it seems to me W. Kroll has indicated a very suggestive approach both in his *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (1924) and in his article *Lehrgedicht in RE*. The new Gow-Scholfield *Nicander* is also it seems to me helpful.

It is the *Aeneid* of which our understanding has been revolutionized by recent scholarship. Wright refers here to R. S. Conway, Mackail, Norden (for his commentary on Book VI), Warde Fowler, Carcopino and Gercke (*Die Entstehung der Aeneis*, 1913). None of these works are very significant except Norden's (in which treatment of the eschatology needs revision in the light of a somewhat less inclusive estimate of Poseidonius, but which is still the best thing available for its stylistic and metrical commentary).

The epoch-making work is, however, Richard Heinze's *Vergils Epische Technik* whose pivotal importance Wright does not seem to grasp though he calls it the 'classic work' on the 'poetic art of the *Aeneid*'. What Heinze did was to show in detail how Virgil's Roman attitude and purpose involved a technique of composition radically different from that of Homer or any Greek (e.g. Apollonius). Unfortunately he overstressed the 'technique' and thus failed to reach a deeper appreciation of Virgil's style and spirit. This is why the recent book of Viktor Pöschl, *Die Dichtkunst Virgils* (1950) makes such a significant advance (fully equal to that of Klingner for *Eclagues* and *Georgics*); his study of the symbolism of the *Aeneid* is both finely conceived and wholly convincing. A completely new dimension has been added to our comprehension of the poem.

Beside Pöschl, the other important work on Virgil's art (A. Cartault *L'art de Virgile dans l'Enéide*, 1926) seems, for all its excellence, rather unimpressive. (Incidentally, though Wright gives considerable space to Warde Fowler's commentaries and even Miss Crump's *The Growth of the Aeneid*, he devotes only a footnote to Pöschl and Cartault.)

We shall not delay long over the Virgilian Appendix. Wright's review makes melancholy reading. No agreement on its authorship has yet been reached. There is much to be said for the Virgilian authorship of the *Culex* and there is at least a plausible case for Gallus' authorship of the *Ciris*. But we cannot be sure: what is important is that the poems represent the general

'neoteric' background of both Gallus and the 'young Virgil'.

2. *Horace*. On the *Odes* and *Epodes* Wright lists the main commentaries—Plessis and Kiessling-Heinze—and the well-known works of Campbell, Pasquali and Naylor. He rightly singles out L. P. Wilkinson's *Horace and his Lyric Poetry* (1946) for special praise: this, in my view, is by far the best recent work in English on Horace or on any Augustan. But he fails to mention Walter Will's *Horaz* (1948), which is perhaps the best single book on Horace now available.

Wright gives us no idea of the main trends and problems. One of the best popular introductions to the major problem here is F. Klingner's article "Horazische und moderne Lyrik" (*Antike* 6 [1939] 65-84). The problem in brief is that Horace in his odes rejects the 'subjectivity' of the *neoterici* (e.g. Catullus and Propertius) and returns to the 'objectivity' of the older Greek lyric. Klingner rightly says here: "Diese Wendung verstehen bedeutet fast Horaz verstehen." This is more than a decision to return to the older classical genres, but implies quite a new—a truly 'Augustan'—attitude toward the world, a new identification of the poet with his environment which is at once a rejection of the Alexandrine and the neoteric point of view. All this was misinterpreted by Heinze as a simple technical matter of adopting the *Anrede* form because Horace lacked inner depth (cf. *NJA* 51 [1923] 168 and Reitzenstein's reply *NJA* 53 [1924] 237). Here the interpretation of the satires and the *Ars Poetica* is indissolubly linked to that of the *Odes* and *Epodes*.

The recent discussion aroused by Jensen's edition of the fifth book of Philodemus (1923), in which *inter alios* Immisch, Rostagni and Klingner have taken part, has not arrived at any very clear result. That Horace did not blindly follow Neoptolemus in the *Ars* (or blindly oppose Philodemus) seems clear and Wright is doubtless correct in thinking the 'true solution lies somewhere between the two extremes,' i.e. of dismissing the hellenistic sources of the *Ars* or of taking them too rigidly.

On the whole it seems to me that Horace's choice of Neoptolemus and his greater formalism marked his rejection of Epicurean literary theory and a return to a more classical and objective conception of poetry. This would seem to be borne out by *Satires* 1.10. (Here the really first class articles of G. L. Hendrickson should have

been mentioned. But I doubt if too much reliance can be put on the fifth book of Philodemus here.

On the *Satires* I would call attention (as Wright does not) to Walter Wili's (*op. cit.*) discussion of the satires as a whole and of course to Lejay's 1911 commentary which Wright wholly correctly describes as 'monumental'. It is indeed the very model of a commentary.

3. *Tibullus*. Wright does not do much but list the major books (Postgate, K. F. Smith, Nemethy, Cartault) and devote his attention to the problems of the *Corpus Tibullianum* (i.e. Book 3 or Books 3-4). As to Tibullus himself, Wright adds, correctly, that he has been a 'comparatively neglected author' but, in my opinion, incorrectly that 'his simple themes of love and country life present no strong challenge to scholarship and offer but little scope for a new assessment.' The fact is that a new treatment of Tibullus is bound up with the old problem of the origin of amatory elegy. Wright (328-329) cites Day (*The Origins of Latin Love-Elegy*, 1938) and the Butler-Barber *Propertius* as indicating a 'Roman' solution to the problem. This is roughly true but slurs over the important point that the elegists depended upon a conventional and hellenistic *sermo amatorius* and various stock motifs (especially those of the new comedy) which presented a problem of combination with their concrete Roman theme (the personal love-affair). It is precisely this mixture of conventional and original elements in Tibullus which constitutes his interest.

4. *Propertius*. Wright pays due attention to the editions of Postgate, Butler-Barber, Richmond and Enk. He does not mention Bonazzi's interesting *Propertius Resartus* (Rome 1951) or Paganelli's Budé text (1929). The discussion of Richmond's weird transpositions seems almost unnecessary. Wright thinks that Propertius' 'sudden transitions may be due to his own confused emotions' (327), and cites in this connection E. Reitzenstein's *Wirklichkeitsbild und Gefühlsentwicklung bei Properz* (1936). This is undoubtedly a work of great value but is distinctly secondary to Walther Abel's remarkable Berlin dissertation *Die Anredeformen bei den römischen Elegikern* (1930) which Wright does not mention. Abel here pointed out that Propertius' form of address is characterized by its direct and personal-dramatic quality. But what is new in Propertius is his use of the 'I' whereas Catullus in spite of his warm subjectivity clung to the 'you'

form of address. Propertius' narrative elegiacs of Books III and IV naturally involved a more objective style. Abel's comparison of Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius with each other and with the Alexandrines shed really new light on both Roman elegy in general and Propertius in particular. No other single work of the last fifty years has renewed Propertius in this way. The other great light on Propertius comes from our much better understanding of his master, Callimachus. We can e.g. see the relation between Propertius IV and the *Aetia* much more clearly.

5. *Ovid*. Wright is especially poor on Ovid. Not only does he omit the major textual work (Magnus, Slater, Rand, Bruère, etc., on the *Metamorphoses*; Alton and Peters on the *Fasti*), but aside from H. Fränkel's *Ovid*, S. G. Owen's excellent edition of *Tristia* II, Purser's *Heroides* and the remarkable article of T. F. Higham, he omits the really significant work, above all the pivotal monographs of Heinze, Alfred Rohde and Hans Diller. The fact is that he does not seem to have read the decisive German work, especially that on the *Metamorphoses*. Here Heinze broke new ground (i.e. in his *Ovids elegische Erzählung*, *Ber. Sachs. Akad.* 71, 7, 1919) in a manner comparable to his work on the *Aeneid*. He over-emphasized the formal distinctions (in his criteria for elegiac and epic styles) but his work is certainly the great point of departure, as A. Rohde and Hans Diller have seen. Wright criticizes Fränkel, as did I, for his 'preconception' as to Ovid's 'deeper significance' in preparing 'the passage from Antiquity to Christianity'. I think however that Wright fails to do Fränkel real justice here.

6. I can add little on Manilius; Wright of course offers a due meed of praise to Housman.

HOBART COLLEGE

B. OTIS

Chapter XII. *Roman Oratory*. By S. F. BONNER. (Pages 335-383).

This chapter is one of the finest in the volume and demonstrates a remarkable combination of painstaking scholarship, keen judgment, and lucid narration. It is not only a survey of the last fifty years of scholarship on "Roman Oratory," rhetoric, and related topics, but may be regarded as a brief history of these subjects among the Romans and an admirable introduction to the study of Cicero.

The chapter is divided into four sections, but

its contents will perhaps be more easily found from the following outline:

1. Pre-Ciceronian oratory: General (pages 335f.), Cato (336-338), others (338-340).

2. Cicero: Relation of the written speeches to the spoken originals (340-342), general works on Cicero's rhetorical theory (342f.), rhetorical analysis of Cicero's speeches (343-346), sources of *de Oratore* (346f.); Cicero's use of examples from (a) philosophy, (b) history, (c) literature (347-349); Cicero's knowledge of law (349-351); Cicero's use of emotional appeal (351f.), humor (352f.), irony (353f.), digressions (354f.); Cicero's style: types (355f.), development (356f.), diction (357ff.), rhythm (358-363).

3. Cicero's contemporaries: Atticism and Asianism (363-368), Calvus and Brutus (367f.), Sallust, Pollio, Maecenas, Augustus (368).

4. Period of Decline: Seneca Rhetor (369-370), subjects of declamation and the Roman law (370-372), Quintilian (372f.), *Institutio Oratoria* and *Dialogus de Oratoribus* (373f.), Pliny the Younger (374), the Latin panegyrists (374f.), conclusion (375f.).

Scholarship on the text and manuscripts of the authors involved is not discussed.

To this superb survey there is very little that need be added. Since Quintilian is included it might have been wise to include also the *Auctor ad Herennium* and the *rethores Latini* in general. Friedrich Marx' old edition of the *ad Herennium* (Leipzig 1894) is still valuable, and we now have a new edition in the Loeb series by Professor Caplan of Cornell (1954). The general topic of the *rethores Latini* is well handled by M. C. Clarke.¹

In the study of the polemical nature of the *Brutus* and *Orator* I have found the work of Schlittenbauer useful.²

An interesting subject, because of its relationship to Stoic theories of style, to first century literature, and to the criticisms made by Quintilian, is the theory of style propounded by Seneca the philosopher in several of his *Epistles to Lucilius*. This was well discussed by Merchant.³

A number of special studies in connexion with Quintilian could be cited. One somewhat out-of-

the-way work is the thesis on Aristotle in which Angermann discussed the important topic of Quintilian's knowledge of Greek authors, of which he took a rather pessimistic but probably accurate view.⁴ Quintilian's Greek terminology is no older than the time of Augustus, and it is difficult to prove that he had opened a roll of Greek poetry or even looked at Plato and Aristotle since boyhood!

Bonner makes several suggestions of the direction which future work in this field might take, stressing the need for collaboration between students of rhetoric and of law, and particularly as applied to Quintilian. The two great needs in the field of ancient rhetoric are a history of the subject from the beginnings—by which I do not mean Plato and Aristotle, but Homer and Hesiod—and annotated editions of the separate books of Quintilian. Bonner's excellent survey of the work to date will assist the laborers in both vineyards.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

G. A. KENNEDY

Chapter XIII. *The Roman Historians*. By A. H. McDONALD. (Pages 384-412)

The chapter on the Roman Historians is by McDonald, an excellent choice, well-known for his studies in Roman History of the second century B.C. and as the author of the article on Roman Historiography in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. His all too brief survey is marked by a clear and comprehensive grasp of the tradition of Roman historiography, awareness of the most significant trends in modern scholarship, and good judgment in analyzing a number of the more important problems relating to individual writers. The works to which the reader is referred are the ones most relevant for the recent development of the problems discussed, and studies published in other languages than English receive due prominence. Within its limits the chapter is a well proportioned and suggestive survey.

The author distinguishes three lines of research which have governed the study of the Roman historians during these fifty years. The first continues the tradition of critical historical analysis with full use of the comparative material as carried on by Mommsen's disciples, an essential contribution to the study of history, but one which, except in the hands of a few outstanding historians, has tended to be isolated from

4. Otto Angermann, *De Aristotele Rhetorum Auctore*, Leipzig 1904, 28ff.

1. M. C. Clarke, *Rhetoric at Rome*, London 1953, 10ff.

2. Sebastian Schlittenbauer, "Die Tendenz von Ciceros *Orator*," *JKPh Suppl.* 28 (1903) 181ff.

3. Frank I. Merchant, "Seneca and his Theory of Style" *AJP* 26 (1905) 44ff.

literary studies and yields a merely partial understanding of the historians themselves. The second, one of great importance, has involved the study of the influence of rhetorical training on the historians, and of the effects of their assimilation of the literary techniques of Hellenistic historiography (a subject hardly known fifty years ago), which they then used independently for purposes of their own. The third is a deeper study of the ideals and concepts that informed their political and historical judgments. Thus recent studies of *auctoritas*, *fides*, and *libertas* illuminate the authors, and reveal—to the profit of our understanding of historical forces, be it added—the significance of the terms in which ideals and propaganda alike were couched.

At the end of his survey of the individual writers the author returns to point out that the most immediate task is to co-ordinate these three approaches, no longer pursuing them in isolation but applying their methods and techniques together. In fact, they have not been pursued wholly in isolation. De Sanctis is mentioned as one who has notably combined them; and almost twenty years ago Tenney Frank wrote: "I actually believe that before long the students of literature are going to write our histories . . . I venture to think that the trend of our studies during the next generation will be toward co-ordinating under our literary departments the many, varied interests in the literary, cultural and social fields" (written in 1936; published in *JHS* 3 [1942] 414).

From the discussion of groups, such as the earlier and the later Annalists, or the individual authors there emerges a careful selection of important problems of interpretation and a clear presentation in outline of the issues they pose. Nor is the study of the technical elements of style forgotten. Yet one could wish for a fuller discussion and for more frequent expression of the author's own conclusions. On Sallust we find the sensible judgment (392): "In fact, Sallust's chief fault is to apply too closely his impression of the underlying causes"; but on the disputed works there appears only, "In this connection [Sallust's historical standpoint] we have to decide how far it is permissible to use the two *Epistulae ad Caesarem* and the *Invectiva in Ciceronem* as evidence for the development of his thought," and there are added references to discussions for and against their authenticity.

On Caesar important questions are posed: the nature and tradition of the *Commentaries*:

"When Caesar wrote his *Commentaries*, he was following a recognized political and literary convention"; the problem of composition and publication: "The difficulty is to decide how far evidence for *composition* may be referred to the question of *publication*." How far does tendentiousness affect the historical truth of his work? "In the end, however, we must apply to Caesar's narrative an analysis as subtle as Caesar's composition, and this will involve close literary examination." How far has Rambaud (mentioned in note 21) supplied it?

Studies of Livy receive a fine appreciation, but one would like to add references to Tenney Frank's attempt (in *Life and Literature in the Roman Republic* 186ff.) to limit current depreciation of the historian's credibility and his capacity to judge his sources, and to Syme's review of Hoffmann's *Livius und der zweite punische Krieg* (*JRS* 35 [1945] 104ff.). Tacitus receives, and deserves, most space, and what is said is admirably judicial.

Suggestive and important as the material included is, the limits remain disappointing. The subject is historians and the plan admits little history, although a number of the more important histories of Rome receive incidental mention. Problems can be presented only in outline with references to the chief studies. One considerable division of scholarly activity during this half-century receives only the briefest mention: textual criticism and commentaries. "A sound apparatus of scholarship was set up last century, and the work has continued to the present. We need only mention the Teubner, Oxford, Budé, Paravian, and Loeb texts, H. Peter's edition of the fragments, and the numerous commentaries which have gathered up the fruits of research." It is true that this does not represent a new trend, yet space was found in other chapters for specific references (for instance, pp. 234ff., on Roman Drama, and 272ff., on Lucretius), and such an enterprise as the edition of Livy by Conway, Walters and Johnson, to mention an outstanding example, marks a very considerable advance.

In a brief survey devoted mainly to the discussion of trends and problems the regular bibliographical aids need not be mentioned, despite the convenience of lists like the one of references to Bursian in note 8 on page 265, but there might perhaps be mention of A. D. Leeman's *A Systematical Bibliography of Sallust* (*Mnemosyne*, Supplement IV, 1952) and N. I. Heres-

cu's *Bibliographie de la littérature latine* (Paris 1943), and, although additions to our ancient texts are scanty, mention also of the new fragments of Sallust's *Histories* (C. H. Roberts, *Catalogue of Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library at Manchester*, III, 56ff., no. 473).

In short, if the purpose is to give a rapid but thoughtful survey of problems and trends, that purpose is successfully achieved in this chapter, but those who use it, though grateful for orientation, should return to the apparatus for themselves if they wish to master the advance of scholarship in detail.¹

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE T. R. S. BROUGHTON

Chapter XIV. *Silver Latin Poetry*. By H. H. HUXLEY. (Pages 413-431)

The compact survey of scholarly activity in the field of Silver Latin poetry which brings this variegated volume to a close lists and appraises editions, commentaries, and translations of Phaedrus, Calpurnius, Lucan, Valerius, Statius, Silius, Martial, Persius, and Juvenal that have appeared in the past sixty years (the author has included the final decade of the nineteenth century in his conspectus).

The task is well done, although there are gaps. A good many of the poems in the Buecheler-Riese *Anthologia latina* date from the Silver period, and mention might have been made of this important collection. Nothing, moreover, is said of work done on the *Ilias latina* or Seneca's

Epigrams. Treatment of literary histories and of books dealing with the several poets is adequate, but the second volume of A. Rostagni's *Storia della letteratura latina* (Turin 1952), which contains some of the most circumstantial criticism of Silver poetry to be found, is not cited, nor are the *Real-Encyclopädie* monographs on Lucan, Silius, and Statius. F. Marx's *Lucan* in *RE* I (1894) 2226-36 is now obsolescent, but was an important contribution in its day; A. Klotz's *Silius* in *III A* (1927) 79-91 remains fundamental, and from R. Helm's *Statius* in *XVIII.3* (1949) 984-1000 one may obtain a much better view of Statian scholarship in the last six decades than from the chapter under review. The same may be said, with respect to Lucan, of E. Malcovati's *Lucano* (2nd ed.; Brescia 1947). This small volume is not only meritorious in itself, but offers much incidental bibliographical information, and is remarkable as the only general study of the poet since the publication of A. Genthe's *De M. Annaei Lucani vita et scriptis* almost one hundred years ago; it is unfortunate that Miss Malcovati's book was overlooked.

Except in the case of Martial, readers will wish that the periodical literature had received more attention. While recognizing the abundance of articles, programs, monographs, and dissertations concerned with Silver poets and poetry, the author makes little attempt to analyze this material, to specify the lines of investigation pursued and the results achieved. If we possessed comprehensive modern studies of the Silver poets in which these scattered researches were assembled and evaluated there would have been less need of doing this, but at the time the survey was written, apart from Miss Malcovati's *Lucano* (where relevant shorter publications are usefully but by no means completely reviewed), such studies were in every instance lacking. An adequate idea, for example, can hardly be formed of Lucanian interpretation in the past thirty years without taking into account E. Fraenkel's "Lucan als Mittler des antiken Pathos," *Vortr. d. Bibl. Warb.* IV (1924), or, more recently, the articles of E. M. Sanford and Professor B. M. Marti.

The importance of the Indexes and Concordances which have been compiled in the last forty years for Silver poets, for the most part in this country, is fittingly stressed. (It was a Concordance rather than an Index to Statius that appeared in 1943 [p. 416]). Apropos of the 1940 Catholic University *Concordance of Lucan* the author curiously remarks "excellent though this is,

1. As a supplement there may be listed a number of articles which register the continued interest of the issues mentioned in this chapter:

- M. Gelzer, "Nochmals über den Anfang der römischen Geschichtsschreibung," *Hermes* 82 (1954) 342ff.
- J. P. V. D. Balsdon, "Some Questions about Historical Writing in the Second Century B.C.," *CQ* NS 3 (1953) 158ff.
- A. D. Leeman, "Sallusts Prologe und sein Auffassung von der Historiographie," *Mnemosyne*, ser. 4, 7 (1954) 323ff.; 8, (1955) 38ff.
- M. Rambaud, "Le soleil de Pharsale," *Historia* 3 (1955) 346ff.
- G. Walser, "Caesars Entdeckung der Germanen und die Tendenz des Bellum Gallicum," *Schweizer Beiträge zur Allgemeinen Geschichte* 11 (1953) 5ff.
- R. Hanslik, "Die Augustusvita Suetons," *WS* 67 (1954) 99ff.
- Ch. Wirszubski, "Cicero's cum dignitate otium: A reconsideration," *JRS* 44 (1954) 1ff.
- H. Wagenvoort, "Felicitas imperatoria," *Mnemosyne*, ser. 4, 7 (1954) 300ff.
- R. T. Bruère, "Tacitus and Pliny's Panegyricus," *CPh* 49 (1954) 161ff.

many will prefer Mooney's book for their private use, since it is cheap, attractively-printed and of a convenient size" (*ibid.*). The functions of an Index and a Concordance are far from identical, and it is doubtful that students engaged in literary as distinguished from grammatical or statistical researches will begrudge the forty-eight shillings the Concordance costs (according to Nairn's latest *Hand-List*), once they have put in some hours looking up the numerical references in Mooney's Index (12s 6d).

In the course of some generally judicious introductory observations, the author complains that scholars have been unduly attracted by *loci similes* and alleged *imitationes*: "Such a preoccupation may lead to results which are far from negligible but must be considered as a flank attack, since, if a late writer is deserving of study, it is the original quality of his work which chiefly compels our attention" (p. 414). To this it may be countered that one of the best ways to assess the originality of an ancient poet is to examine how he adapts and transforms the work of his predecessors; such examination must in great degree be based upon *imitationes* and *loci similes*. Apropos of L. Legras' *Etude sur la Thébaïde de Stace* the author comments: "Writing in 1953 I should say that it stands midway between Heinze and Pierre Fargue's [Fargues'] *Claudien*, a book written nearly thirty years after Legras" (*ibid.*); the precise meaning of this statement is not clear to the reviewer.

Most of the Silver poets were read with zeal and relish from the Dark Ages until Victorian times, and exerted great literary influence throughout these centuries. Consequently it is regrettable that nothing is said of researches devoted to various aspects of their *Fortleben*. To cite Lucanian examples once more, both Clotilde Schlayer's *Spuren Lukans in der spanischen Dichtung* (Heidelberg 1928), and W. Fischli's *Studien zum Fortleben der Pharsalia des M. Annaeus Lucanus* (Lucerne ca. 1947) are helpful to students of the poet whose interests are not restricted to antiquity. And the old Irish version of the *Thebaid*, *Togail na Tebe*, which was edited in 1922 by G. Calder, might appropriately have been mentioned as evidence of the medieval currency of this epic.

Despite the foregoing reservations this is a commendable and timely survey. Mr. Huxley properly stresses the amount of work remaining to be done in the field and puts forward several good suggestions: the "comparative study of the

language of the four Post-Augustan epics, a study which would carefully analyze their relations to each other," which is desiderated on page 417, is indeed a desirable project, although it would seem rather a large order for a single scholar, however laborious, and readers of Silius Italicus will agree that "the time is ripe for a revaluation of his poetic gifts" (p. 424); there is small doubt that a competent revaluation would largely rehabilitate this talented and prudent poet.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO RICHARD T. BRUÈRE

MISPRINTS

Some of the misprints which owners of the volume will wish to correct are collected here. Those for Chapters V (Greek Philosophy) and VI (Greek History) are not separated from the addenda to the chapters, but all are printed after the reviews. A few other corrections are scattered through the reviews.

P. 36 n. 7, line 5: for *Aeine* read *Asine*; *ibid.*: for *Person* read *Persson*.

72 line 9: for *Scheidewin* read *Schneidewin*.

74.11: the reference number given as if to n. 20 should be to n. 29.

95 n. 108.3: for *Los Angeles* read *Berkeley* and *Los Angeles*.

125 last line: for (1933) read (1938).

159.16: "style is the man": this misrepresents Buffon's dictum. B. said style "est de l'homme même," that is, could not be stolen from him. He did not mean that style mirrored the character of the writer. "We point this out in CP from time to time, and several people have written papers on the subject in the last half-century" (R. T. Bruère).

235.22: for *West* read *Wiest*.

237.8: for L. Jachmann read G. Jachmann.

237.6 f.b.: for *Terenti* read *Terentianus*.

251.7: for *Standford* read *Stanford*.

251.16: for *Le métrique* read *La métrique*.

253.8 f.b.: for *Stochert* read *Stechert*.

254.10: for J.P. read P.J.

263.12: for *Senecca* read *Seneca*.

263.8 f.b.: for *inconvenients* read *inconvenients*.

265 n. 7, line 8: for *Harrasowitz* read *Harrassowitz*.

270 n. 96, line 2: for P. B. Steele read R. B. Steele.

326.10 f.b.: for *Latin* read *English*.

327.9: for *Properti* read *Propertii*.

327.19: for *omnia* read *opera*.

333 n.2.: for *Hermann* read *Herrmann*.

389.15: for *Wirzsubski* read *Wirszubski*.

415 running head: read *Silver Latin Poetry*.

416.6 f.b.: for 1940 read 1939.

419.13: insert comma after "progress."

423.19-20: for *Jannaconne* read *Jannaccone*.

424.14 f.b.: for *three* read *two*.

425.14: for *moralmento* read *moralmente*.

428.2 f.b. (of text): for *human* read *humane*.